

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's attention to the above referenced application. Claims 1-27 were rejected. Claims 1, 2, 8, 12, 13, 17, and 24 have been amended. Claims 1-27 are now pending, of which claims 1, 8, 12, 17, and 24 are independent.

Interview Summary

Applicants express appreciation for the Examiner's time and attention during an interview conducted on April 20, 2010, between Examiner Ryan Jakovac and Applicants' representative D'Ann Naylor Rifai. While agreement regarding patentability was not reached, Examiner Jakovac agreed that the prior art references Mastronardi and Dengler do not appear to teach feedback from the user that comprises ratings of titles of the multimedia content specified in the play list. Applicants have amended the independent claims to include such limitations.

35 USC § 103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mastronardi (U.S. Patent No: 6,346,951), and further in view of Dengler (U.S. Patent No: 6,581,103). Applicants respectfully submit that assert that the amendments submitted herein overcome the rejection.

Amended independent claim 1 is shown below:

1. A method comprising:
creating a play list;
occasionally connecting a portable device of a user to a network;
submitting the play list to a multimedia content provider through the network, wherein
the multimedia content provider gathers multimedia content specified in the play list;
downloading the multimedia content to a multimedia content cache in the portable device;
disconnecting the portable device from the network;
playing the multimedia content on the portable device;

recording feedback from the user about the multimedia content specified in the play list, wherein the feedback comprises a plurality of ratings, each rating of the plurality of ratings corresponding to a respective title of the multimedia content specified in the play list;

uploading the feedback to the multimedia content provider when connected to the network, wherein the multimedia content provider uses the plurality of ratings to provide recommended multimedia content to the user; and

selectively downloading the recommended multimedia content to the multimedia content cache in the portable device.

Independent claims 8, 12, 17, and 24 contain substantially similar limitations.

Neither Mastronardi and Dengler, either alone or in combination, teaches feedback from the user that comprises ratings of titles of the multimedia content specified in the play list. Consequently, neither Mastronardi or Dengler teaches the multimedia content provider using the ratings to provide recommended multimedia content to the user. Because these limitations are not taught by the prior art, independent claims 1, 8, 12, 17 and 24 are allowable for at least this reason. Applicants respectfully request that independent claims 1, 8, 12, 17, and 24, and their respective dependent claims 2-7, 9-11, 13-16, 18-23, and 25-27 be allowed to pass to issuance.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the remarks and amendments set forth above. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (512) 732-1303. Please charge any shortage of fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 50-0221 and please credit any excess fees to such account.

Respectfully submitted,

Customer No. 59796

Dated: 4/22/10

/D'Ann Naylor Rifai/

D'Ann Naylor Rifai,

Reg. No. 47,026

Patent Attorney

Intel Corporation

(512) 732-1303

Intel Corporation

c/o CPA Global

P.O. Box 52050

Minneapolis, MN 55402